



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/689,253	10/20/2003	Randall E. Juenger	DC-05519	3858

7590 08/20/2009  
Robert W. Holland  
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP  
PO Box 203518  
Austin, TX 78720

EXAMINER
----------

SPITTLE, MATTHEW D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/20/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/689,253	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JUENGER, RANDALL E.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MATTHEW D. SPITTLE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2111	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1 – 22 have been examined.

The Examiner's Answer mailed 3/17/2008 is hereby vacated. Prosecution is reopened for the purpose of clarifying the Examiner's position on claims 9 – 22 to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, as well as providing the Applicant with an appropriate opportunity to respond. Applicant may elect to respond to this Office Action by filing an Appeal Brief or an amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 – 3, 8, 9, 11 – 14, 17, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro product, with evidence

Art Unit: 2111

provided by The Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Product Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2), and the Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4), in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212), and in view of was old and well known in the art.

Examiner notes that the publishing date of the DT4 reference does not meet 35 USC 102 requirements, however, DT2 does. DT4 is cited for providing more detailed information about the DT2 product. Since both describe the same product(s), the entire DT4 disclosure of the "SideCar PlusTwo Pro" product is presumed to be inherent in the DT2 reference. The Examiner notes that although the DT4 reference appears to correspond to a different model (PlusFour vs. PlusTwo) of the product, review of the DT4 reference, particularly page 3, shows that it does correspond to the PlusTwo product also.

Regarding claims 1, 17 and 21, DT2 teach (using the DT4 "Installation and User Guide") an information handling system comprising:

A housing (p. 3, see notebook computer housing);

Processing components disposed in the housing and operable to generate display information. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously old and well known in this art for notebook computers to have processing components which are disposed in the housing and operable to generate display information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to house the processing components of the notebook computer within the notebook computer housing, since to do so is routine in this art;

A graphics component interfaced with the processing components and operable to output the display information as a DVO signal. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art for a notebook computer as disclosed to output display information, particularly as a DVO signal, since DVO signals provide a higher quality display (see p. 13 for evidence, Digital DVI). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize output display information on the notebook computer, since to do so is routine in this art;

A selector interfaced with the graphics component to receive the DVO signal having first and second selectable outputs (Examiner notes that the software allows the outputs to be selected for use; p. 43, see 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> bulleted paragraphs – “Checkbox: “Use this device as the primary monitor“; pages 95 – 97; Also on p. 43, see "Checkbox: “Extend my Windows desktop: activates or deactivates a monitor””; The Examiner notes that activating/deactivating a monitor corresponds directly to selecting/deselecting a graphics output, through the Windows software controls).

A first DVI connector operable to provide the DVI output at the housing to an external display (p. 3, Notebook external monitor cable). While the reference only teaches a **cable**, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known for a notebook computer to have a DVI connector which attaches to the monitor cable for the purpose of providing a means of connecting the two. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a DVI connector for the purpose of connecting a notebook computer to a cable, since to do so is routine in this art;

Art Unit: 2111

A docking connector operable to provide the DVI output at the housing to a docking station (where the docking connector corresponds to a PC card connector; p. 16. It can be called a docking connector, because it provides a connection to a docking station, namely the SideCar PlusTwo unit shown in the bottom figure on page 3).

DT2 fails to teach a first and second TMDS transmitter. For purposes of examination, the Examiner has interpreted the “multiplexer output” as claimed on line 9 of claim 1, as well as the “selector output” on line 13 of claim 1 to mean the same.

Acharya et al. teach that TMDS transmission is well-known for use with flat panel displays, and allows fewer wires to be used for image data lower power consumption, better protection against EMI, and higher transmission speeds (col. 12, line 59 – col. 13, line 5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention by Applicant to incorporate the TMDS transmitters of Acharya et al. into the system of DT2 for the purpose of providing image data with fewer wires, lower power consumption, better protection against EMI, and higher transmission speeds. This would have been obvious to improve performance and make the system more reliable.

Thus, all of the elements of claim 1 are taught by the combination of references, or obvious in view of what was old and well known in the art.

Claim 9 recites a method having substantially similar limitations as in claim 1 above. In that the system of claim 1 is obvious as described above, the acts

Art Unit: 2111

corresponding to the supporting disclosure corresponding to claim 9 are likewise obvious and is therefore rejected using the same rationale.

Regarding claim 2, DT2 teach (using the DT4 User Guide) the additional limitation of a docking station operable to couple to the housing and to accept the docking connector (where a docking station is interpreted as the combination of the Notebook/Sidecar PC Card interface cable and the SideCar PlusTwo unit; p. 3; Also see the figure on page 17 which shows the SideCar unit);

A second DVI connector interfaced with the docking connector (p. 3, SideCar monitor cables) and operable to provide the DVI output at the docking station to an external display (p. 3, where the external display is monitor #3). Examiner notes that the display port is provided with a second DVI connector for use with supplied mating cables (See DT2, page 2, section "Display ports/adapter").

Regarding claims 3, 12 – 14, DT2 teach (using the DT4 User Guide) the additional limitation comprising:

A docking station detector operable to determine inserting of the information handling system into the docking station (p. 24 – 28; see in particular on page 24, "Windows will detect one or more devices called a "PCI to PCI bridge"... "PCI bridges are part of the logical connection between your notebook and the SideCar.");

Art Unit: 2111

A switch interfaced with the docking station detector and the selector and operable to select the first TMDS transmitter if the housing is not coupled to the docking station and to select the second TMDS transmitter if the housing is coupled to the docking station (Examiner notes that the software allows the outputs to be selected for use; p. 43, see "Checkbox: "Extend my Windows desktop...""; This means would appear to allow any monitor coupled externally to the notebook computer to be selected and de-selected, whether or not the housing is coupled to the SideCar (docking station)).

Regarding claims 8 and 11, DT2 teach (using the DT4 User Guide) the additional limitation comprising a display monitor operable to interface with the second DVI connector to present the display information when the housing is coupled to the docking station (p. 3, see monitor #3).

Claims 11 - 14 recite a method having substantially similar limitations as in claims 3 and 8 above. In that the system of claims 3 and 8 is obvious as described above, the acts corresponding to the supporting disclosure corresponding to claims 11 - 14 are likewise obvious and is therefore rejected using the same rationale.

\* \* \*



Art Unit: 2111

Claims 4 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro product with evidence provided by the Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2), Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4), and in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212), Barlow et al. (U.S. 6,311,263), and what was old and well known in the art.

Regarding claim 4, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the selector and the first and second TMDS transmitters are fabricated as an application specific integrated circuit. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art to use an ASIC to implement some logic function as evidenced by Barlow et al. (col. 20, lines 57 – 63), since ASIC devices are low cost and have low power consumption, and thus, such would have been obvious to employ in combination with the prior art.

Claim 22 recites a system having substantially similar limitations as in claim 4 and is rejected using the same rationale.

\* \* \*

Claims 5, 6, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro product with evidence provided by the Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2), Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide

Art Unit: 2111

(hereafter referred to as DT4), and in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212), Merkin et al. (U.S. 6,584,561), and what was old and well known in the art.

Regarding claim 5, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the graphics component comprises a graphics and memory controller hub. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art for a computer system, such as a notebook computer, to contain a graphics and memory controller hub, as evidenced by Merkin et al. (col. 3, lines 38 – 42), and thus, such would have been obvious to employ in combination with the prior art.

Regarding claim 6, DT2 fails to explicitly teach wherein the graphics component comprises a graphics processor unit. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art for a computer system, such as a notebook computer, to contain a graphics processor unit, as evidenced by Merkin et al. (col. 3, lines 38 – 42; Fig. 1, 130), and thus, such would have been obvious to employ in combination with the prior art.

Claims 15 and 16 recite a method having substantially similar limitations as in claims 5 and 6 above. In that the system of claims 5 and 6 is obvious as described above, the acts corresponding to the supporting disclosure corresponding to claims 15 and 16 are likewise obvious and is therefore rejected using the same rationale.

\* \* \*

Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro product with evidence provided by the Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification sheet (hereafter referred to as DT2), Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide (hereafter referred to as DT4), and in view of Acharya et al. (U.S. 7,123,212), Merrill (U.S. Pub. 2002/0036694), and what was old and well known in the art.

Regarding claim 7, DT2 fails to explicitly teach a projector. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in this art to use a projector with a DVI connector for the purposes of presenting display information. This is evidenced by Merrill (par. 116), and thus, such would have been obvious to employ in combination with the prior art.

Claim 10 recites a method having substantially similar limitations as in claim 7 above. In that the system of claim 7 is obvious as described above, the acts corresponding to the supporting disclosure corresponding to claim 10 are likewise obvious and is therefore rejected using the same rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW D. SPITTLE whose telephone number is (571)272-2467. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 5:30.

Art Unit: 2111

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 571-272-3632. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. D. S./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2111

/MARK RINEHART/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2111